

utilize siding and porches on the wings to further resemble 'area farmhouses.' The Applicant's representative testified that the Applicant's design attempts to construct a building similar to local architecture in the area. He stated that the building design will contain red brick, different shades of hard plank siding, and lighter trim around the edges. He indicated that a number of units will have balconies or patios with railings to enhance a residential 'feel' to the building.

24. The Applicant's representative testified that the building design contains a cupola feature over the grand lobby. He stated that natural light is an important consideration for elders in assisted living and memory care facilities. The Applicant's representative testified that the cupola area comes 'all the way down to the ground floor, right into the grand lobby.' The Applicant's representative testified that the memory care wing is located to the right of the grand lobby. He stated the Applicant also 'pops' up the roof over the activities area in the memory care wing to provide more natural light for the residents.
25. The Applicant's representative testified that the site plan wraps around under the covered porch (portico). He stated that immediately adjacent to the grand lobby space are administrative offices and a concierge desk. He reiterated that the memory care unit is to the right of the grand lobby. The Applicant's representative testified that there are two central halls. He stated that the front hall will be an activities space wherein the Applicant will "pop" up the roof to allow for additional light. The Applicant's representative testified that the hall located to the rear will be a dedicated dining area for the memory care residents. He stated that the facility also designed a

dedicated outdoor courtyard, which is adjacent to the building. He stated this area will be dedicated for memory care residents.

26. The Applicant's representative also provided testimony as to the bulk of the remainder of the building design in accordance with exhibit "A-2". He stated that the primary kitchen and dining facilities, classrooms, sunroom, bistro, and all core amenities will be located toward the front, in the center of the building's common space. He stated that to the left of the primary dining space, there is an elevated patio. He stated the patio faces the wooded wetlands area on the site.
27. The Applicant's representative testified that the core number of assisted living units are located towards the rear of the building. He stated that the site grade drops towards the rear of the building. The Applicant testified that there will be three (3) floors of assisted living units in the rear of the building.
28. The Applicant's representative testified that the lowest floor will house the residents requiring a transitional level of care. He stated the remaining two floors will be dedicated to traditional assisted living apartments.
29. The Applicant's representative testified that the proposed building will be designed to contain additional amenity space, a wellness area, an area for physical and occupational therapy, and an exercise area.
30. The Applicant testified that access to the site is via right-in/right-out from Route 1. He stated that the Applicant is also proposing a monument sign which will be located in the median space. He stated that the sign will be a ground lit sign and comply with all Township requirements.

31. The Applicant's representative testified that this will be Harbor Retirement's first facility in New Jersey.
32. Under Board questioning, the Applicant's representative testified that the proposed building will have one hundred twenty (120) units. He stated thirty (30) of those units are located in the memory care wing. He stated eight (8) of those units are semi-private. The Applicant's representative stated that the Applicant can have a total of thirty eight (38) residents in the memory care unit.
33. The Applicant's representative testified that there are ninety (90) remaining units. He stated that twenty-five (25) units are located on the Terrace Level, which is the transitional care level. The Applicant testified that the remaining sixty five (65) units are located on the remaining two floors. He stated that sixteen (16) of those units are semi-private units/rooms.
34. Under Board questioning, the Applicant's representative testified that maximum residential capacity is between 150 and 160 residents.
35. The Applicant's engineer testified that he is familiar with the site. He stated that the proposed site is 25.95 acres. He stated that the site is almost entirely wooded. He stated that the site slopes from the southeast corner to the northwest corner. The Applicant's engineer testified that there is approximately 30 feet of 'fall' from the front of the site to the rear of the site. He stated that the center of the parcel is located 800 ft. north of the Ridge Road intersection with Route 1.
36. The Applicant's engineer testified that the parcel is split zoned. He stated that the front portion abutting Route 1 is located in the OR office research zone and the

residential R-1 zone is in the rear. He stated that the OR zone consists of 9.7 acres and the R-1 zone consists of 16.25 acres.

37. The Applicant's engineer testified that the property is 'bound' to the south by Route

1. He stated that the 'Dow Jones Complex' is across Route 1. The Applicant's engineer testified that to the west and east of the site are properties owned by the New Jersey Division of Transportation. He stated that further to the rear of the site, along the west, there are numerous residences situated on Ridge Road. He also testified that the Freedom Trail is along the rear of the property. He stated that the closest residence is approximately 635 feet away on Ridge Road.

38. The Applicant's engineer testified that the site has 527 ft. of frontage along Route 1.

He stated that there are utilities, water, and electric along Route 1 southbound. He stated that the sanitary sewer line and gas line are across Route 1.

39. The Applicant's engineer testified that the site is heavily wooded. He stated that the site is constrained by the presence of wetlands, stream corridor, and flood plains. He stated that, due to site constraints, there is only approximately seven (7) acres that can be disturbed or developed. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant will attempt to connect sanitary sewer lines along the rear of the property. He stated that the connections will be permanent and traverse the wetlands. The Applicant's engineer stated that the Applicant will submit for a transition waiver area permit.

The Applicant's engineer testified that approximately 19.8 acres (76%) of the site will be permanently preserved in its natural condition. He stated that the new building and parking are proposed to be sited on the OR portion of the site, with access from Route 1. He stated that the building will be set back over 170 ft. from the existing

roadway. The Applicant's engineer testified that approximately 6.3 acres (24% of the site) is proposed to be disturbed for construction. He stated that the disturbance will be entirely within the OR portion of the site, on the Route 1 frontage.

40. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant is proposing to develop an 113,451 sq. ft. assisted living and memory care facility. He stated the building will be oriented to Route 1 and be located approximately 170 ft. back from the front property line. He stated that the facility will comply with all bulk requirements of the zone. The Applicant's engineer stated that the Applicant is proposing an 113,451 sq. ft. building with separate wings for assisted senior living and memory care residents. He stated that the proposed front yard setback is 169 feet, wherein only 100 feet is required. The Applicant's engineer testified that the proposed rear yard setback is 977 feet.
41. The Applicant's engineer testified that the façade varies from one to three stories. He stated the one-story portion of the facility will house memory care patients.
42. The Applicant's Engineer testified that the site slopes from the front to the rear. He stated that there will be less than a five (5) foot retaining wall along the property line. The Applicant's engineer testified that there is a small tributary that drains to Heathcote Brooke, which flows under the Delaware Raritan Canal to the Millstone River.
43. The Applicant's Engineer testified that the building height will be 53'6". He stated that would require a side yard setback of 53'6". The Applicant's engineer stated that the side yard setback must meet the height of the existing building. The Applicant's Engineer testified that the Applicant is only providing a side yard setback of forty

(40) feet. He opined that the unique characteristic of the property, and given the fact that the site cannot be developed to the North, 40 ft. is sufficient to meet the intent of side yard setback in the zoning ordinance.

44. The Applicant's engineer testified that there will be a right-in/right-out driveway along Route 1. He stated that Route 1 has two (2) 12 ft. travel lane sections, a concrete barrier, and a full eleven (11') ft. wide shoulder. He described the site circulation. He stated that patients will be dropped off via the roundabout under the covered main entrance. The Applicant's engineer testified that the main access to the site is a right-in/right-out driveway along Route 1, which leads to the turnaround and access to the parking and service areas. The Applicant agreed to install sidewalks in accordance with the recommendations of the Board's engineer. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant will install a Five (5') ft. wide sidewalks along the property frontage. He stated that the Applicant will also provide a sidewalk connection around the bio retention area that goes around the building and connects to the walking paths along the rear of the detention basin.

45. The Applicant's engineer testified that, at present, there is no driveway on the site. He stated that the Applicant would meet all NJDOT requirements for a minor access permit. He stated that the Applicant will submit a minor access plan and comply with all NJDOT requirements. The applicant's engineer testified that he recognized that questions exists as to whether the applicant should be required to widen Route 1 along its frontage to provide an additional shoulder. He stated that the Applicant is requesting a waiver of the Board's engineer's recommendation. However, he reiterated that the Applicant believed that the request was not necessary and stated

that the Applicant would submit a Minor Access Permit and comply with all NJDOT requirements.

46. The Board's engineer testified that the Township of South Brunswick Police Department recommended that the Applicant add a shoulder to its Route 1 frontage. He stated that he recommends that the Applicant be required to submit a plan to the DOT for an Access Permit which demonstrates the implementation of an additional shoulder. He stated that it was his opinion to allow NJDOT to determine whether the NJDOT wants the Applicant to incorporate the shoulder widening into their plan.
47. The Board's engineer opined that an additional shoulder is required because the existing shoulder is currently being used as an additional travel lane. He stated that the submitted Access Plan should be designed to accommodate a shoulder. The Board's engineer stated that if the NJDOT determines that, at this time, the Applicant is not required to provide an additional shoulder or declines to accept a right of way dedication, then the Township will require a right of way dedication along the frontage of the site.
48. The Applicant's engineer testified that there is an adequate site triangle. He stated that the 25 ft. driveway circulates, counter clockwise, around the building. He opined the SU40 and fire trucks can efficiently circulate around the site.
49. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant received a FHA Line Verification and wetlands LOI, which were recorded with the County. He stated that there is a fifty (50') foot buffer.
50. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant is required to provide a 200 foot buffer in the OR zone due to its proximity to the residential zone. He states that the

applicant is attempting to preserve the area. He stated that it is a transitional area.

The applicant's engineer testified that the area is sufficiently buffered and that the

Applicant wants to keep the area as natural as possible. He stated that the Applicant is requesting relief from the condition that the Applicant be required to construct a ten (10') foot berm.

51. The Applicant's engineer testified that there is also a 200 foot stream corridor protection line which allows for fifty (50%) percent disturbance. He stated that the Applicant is slightly over that percentage and requires a waiver. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant will restore the area to its natural condition. He stated that no concrete or impervious coverage is proposed. The board's engineer confirmed that the Township Ordinance allowed fifty (50%) percent disturbance within the stream corridor protection zone. He stated he has no objection to granting the waiver.

52. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant is providing raised walkways, in accordance to exhibit "A-7", along some of the walkways in the rear parking lot. However, he stated that the Township Ordinance requires an elevated walkway around the entire rear parking area. The Applicant's Engineer requested a partial waiver of the walkway requirement. The Board's Engineer confirmed that the Township Ordinance required an elevated sidewalk around the entire parking lot. He stated that he has no objection to the requested relief because the walkway would not be utilized and would result in the elimination of a lot of the proposed landscaping. He stated he had no objection to the walkway provided as noted in Exhibit "A-7."



53. The Applicant's engineer testified that the storm water management system design meets all N.J.A.C. criteria including quality, quantity and recharge. He stated the site will maintain three (3) storm water management facilities. He stated that there will be a dry bio-retention area in the front that provides a modicum of detention. The Applicant's engineer testified that there will be no pool of standing water. He stated that the Applicant is installing a dry bio-retention area. He stated a dry bio-retention area will be located in area two, which is similar to a swale. He stated it will not have a standing pool of water. The Applicant's engineer testified that the proposed storm water detention basin has been designed in accordance with the Township of South Brunswick's standard and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) storm water management rules. The Applicant's Engineer testified that the storm water management design utilized two separate bio-retention systems for storm water runoff treatment and an infiltration basin with an outlet control to reduce post development release rates. He stated the storm water BMP's were designed in accordance with the NJDEP BMP Manual.
54. The Applicant's engineer testified that there is also a dry infiltration basin in the rear. He stated that the DRCC will perform a storm water management review and provide a report of its findings relative to the project.
55. The Applicant's Engineer testified that the Applicant will install a grease trap to address kitchen waste. He stated that the Applicant is attempting to connect utilities to the twenty (20") inch line along Freedom Trail. He stated that there is also a twelve (12") inch gravity line along Route 1 northbound.

56. The Applicant's engineer testified that a sanitary line comes out the back of the building around the basin approximately 1,600 ft. to the Freedom Trail. He stated that the requested I&I report is to confirm that the existing sanitary lines can meet the Applicant's capacity needs. The Applicant agreed, as a condition of approval, to comply with the I&I report recommendations. Under Board questioning, the Board's engineer testified that if the Applicant can not comply with the INI report recommendations, the Applicant will be required to either seek alternative locations for sanitary line connections or, in the alternative, abandon the project. For example, the Board's engineer stated that the Applicant can connect to the sewer main on Route 1, or the Applicant can increase the sewer size in the rear. He stated that if the Applicant cannot comply with the request, the Applicant will not receive the appropriate building permits and subsequent Certificate of Occupancy. The Applicant's engineer testified that sanitary sewer system will connect to the existing twenty (20") inch public sewer main located 1,000 ft. from the northwest of the proposed building.
57. The Applicant's engineer testified that there is a proposed water main extension to the building. He stated that there is a twelve (12") inch main along the front of the property. The Applicant's engineer testified that, as a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with Chief Laird's comments regarding a siamese connection and the addition of a fire hydrant.
58. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant is also proposing a monument sign that will comply with the Township Ordinance requirements. He stated that the

sign will be located in the front of the site. The Applicant's engineer stated that the sign will be approximately 36 sq. ft.

59. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant is providing adequate lighting. He stated that the Applicant is proposing 34 pole lighting fixtures. He stated that each fixture will have a mounting height of fourteen (14') feet. The Applicant's engineer testified that the nearest home is approximately 635 ft. away. He stated the lights will be directed and shielded. The Applicant's engineer opined that there will be no spillage onto adjacent properties.
60. Under Board questioning, the Applicant's engineer agreed, as a condition of approval, to place the rear parking lot lights on motion sensors. The Applicant agreed to comply with the recommendations of the Board's engineer regarding the installation and implementation of the motion sensors. The Applicant agreed to place the lights on timers from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., in accordance with the recommendations of the Board's engineer. The rear parking lot lights shall then be motion sensor activated.
61. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant needs to replace 1,162 trees. He stated that the Applicant will replace 233 trees leaving a deficit of approximately 920 trees. The Applicant requested a waiver, and agreed to as a condition of approval, to comply with the Township of South Brunswick Tree Replacement cost schedule. The Applicant agreed to make a payment in accordance with the tree replacement cost schedule in lieu of planting approximately 920 trees.
62. Under Board questioning, the Board's engineer confirmed that street trees affect the visibility of the building. He stated that the building is attractive. He opined that the

proposed landscaping plan would suffice. The Board's engineer stated he did not object to the waiver request. The Applicant's engineer testified that the Applicant is requesting a waiver of the Township requirement that the Applicant provide street trees, 50 ft. on center. He stated that the Applicant is not proposing any facade signage and is concerned that the street trees would obstruct sight line to the building.

63. The Applicant's traffic engineer testified that the OR zone required 400 parking spaces and a similarly sized hospital would require 500 parking spaces. He stated that the Applicant is proposing 107 parking spaces. The Applicant's traffic engineer opined that 107 parking spaces would adequately address the Applicant's needs. The Applicant's traffic engineer testified that the New Jersey Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) requires .5 parking spaces per unit. He stated that the Applicant is proposing .75 parking spaces per unit. Vehicular access will be provided around the entire building for emergency services. He opined that the parking spaces are adequate to address the Applicant's needs.

64. The Applicant's traffic engineer testified that the Applicant will be providing one hundred seven (107) parking spaces. He stated that the Applicant will locate thirty (30) parking spaces in the front of the building. The Applicant's traffic engineer testified that there will be three (3) ADA parking spaces, including one van space out front. He stated the rear parking area will have seventy six (76) parking spaces. The Applicant's traffic engineer testified that the Applicant will provide a shuttle service. The Applicant's traffic engineer opined that the Applicant is providing adequate parking to address the Applicant's parking needs.